



*Makalenin Türü: Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article
*Geliş Tarihi / First Received: 20.04.2023
*Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 24.05.2023
*Atıf Bilgisi: Gürel, K. T. (2023). "Why Asian Countries Should Democratise: A Comparison With Western Countries". Hars Akademi, 6 (1), 45-56.
*Citation: Gürel, K. T. (2023) "Asya Ülkeleri Neden Demokratikleşemiyor: Batı Ülkeleriyle Bir Karşılaştırma". Hars Akademi, 6 (1), 45-56.

WHY ASIAN COUNTRIES SHOULD DEMOCRATISE: A COMPARISON WITH WESTERN COUNTRIES

*Kazım Tolga GÜREL**

Abstract

Most of Asia's class societies are still ruled by totalitarian states, and totalitarianism necessarily produces enemies. This is necessary to legitimize its authority and preserve its authoritarianism. As is well known in political science, these states rule by dividing and segregating the people they lead. These policies of segregation are highly functional for the sustainability of governments. In terms of political economy, this segregation ensures that the cheap labour force, especially exposed to hate speech, is marginalized and unemployed, becomes cheap labour in sectors and factories, and can be substituted with similarly positioned counterparts within the large mass of unemployed when necessary. Of course, this situation is observed all over the world. However, it can be said that as totalitarianism increases, such distinctions also increase.

This hinders the democratization of Asian countries and keeps hate speech alive. Even if there are laws preventing hate speech, they are not functional. These laws remain on paper and have no impact on life. Therefore, democratic structures cannot be established, and those sets cannot maintain functionality. There are irreconcilable contradictions between the spread of hate speech, primarily through communication tools, and democracy.

The question is whether the state exists for humans or the state. The state is a six thousand-year-old phenomenon, and for the last two hundred and fifty years, there have been states where the people have been involved in governance. Before that, the state was the monopoly of a family, a group or a single person. This monopoly was first broken in Europe and the United States of America and the people were able to vote. Women's suffrage came much later. Today, however, many countries in Asia are still legally ruled by a man or a group of men. Asia is the most populous continent in the world. In this sense, half of the world is still ruled by dictatorships. More interestingly, in many Asian countries, the people aspire to this oligarchy and stay away from democracy. This study discusses the reasons for this within the framework of a comparative historical analysis.

Keywords: State, Democracy, Dictatorship, Capitalism, Emperialism.

* Dr., Eskişehir. kazimtolgagurel@gmail.com / ORCID: 0000-0002-1893-8887.

ASYA ÜLKELERİ NEDEN DEMOKRATİKLEŞEMİYOR: BATI ÜLKELERİYLE BİR KARŞILAŞTIRMA

*Kazım Tolga GÜREL**

Öz

Asya'nın sınıflı toplumlarının çoğu hala totaliter devletler tarafından yönetilmektedir ve totalitarizm zorunlu olarak bir iç ya da dış düşman üreterek yaşayabilir. Bu, devlet otoritesini meşrulaştırmak ve otoriterliğini korumak için gereklidir. Siyaset biliminde çok iyi bilindiği gibi, bu devletler hâkim oldukları insanları bölerek ve ayrıştırarak yönetirler. Bu ayrıştırma politikaları ve düşman üretme hükümetlerin sürdürülebilirliği açısından son derece işlevseldir. Ekonomi politik açıdan bu ayrıştırma, özellikle nefret söylemine maruz kalan azınlığın ucuz işgücü olarak marjinalleştirir. Bir kısım işsiz, işgücünün değerini azaltır ve işgücü deposu olarak yedeklenerek elde tutulur. Bu durum Asya ülkelerinin demokratikleşmesini engelleyen faktörlerden biridir ve nefret söylemini canlı tutmayla da ilişkilidir. Nefret söylemini engelleyen yasalar olsa bile işlevsel değildir. Bu yasalar çoğu zaman kâğıt üzerinde kalır ve hayata etkisi olmamaktadır. Dolayısıyla demokratik yapılar kurulamamaktadır. Nefret söyleminin başta iletişim araçları olmak üzere, pek çok araç tarafından yaygınlaştırılması ile demokrasi arasında uzlaşmaz çelişkiler vardır. Meselenin özü, devletin mi insan için var olduğu yoksa insanın mı devlet için var olduğudur. Devlet altı bin yıllık bir olgudur ve son iki yüz elli yıldır halkın yönetime dahil olduğu devletlerden söz edilebilir. Ondan önce devlet bir ailenin, bir grubun ya da tek bir kişinin tekelindedir. Bu tekel ilk olarak Avrupa ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nde kırılmıştır ve halklar oy kullanabilmiştir. Kadınların oy hakkı çok daha sonra gelmiştir. Ancak bugün Asya'daki pek çok ülke hala yasal olarak bir erkek ya da bir grup erkek tarafından yönetilmektedir. Asya dünyanın en kalabalık kıtasıdır. Bu anlamda dünyanın yarısı hala diktatörlüklerle yönetilmektedir. Daha da ilginç birçok Asya ülkesinde halk bu oligarşiye özenmekte ve demokrasiden uzak durmaktadır. Bu çalışmada bunun nedenleri tartışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Devlet, Demokrasi, Diktatörlük, Kapitalizm, Emperyalizm.

* Dr., Eskişehir. kazımtolgagurel@gmail.com / ORCID: 0000-0002-1893-8887.

Introduction

At first glance, democracy is seen as a Western ideology. It was used in Ancient Greece with the combination of the terms "Demos" people and "Krates" government. However, it was not born in Ancient Greece. As Clifford D. Conner points out in *A People's History of Science*, published in 2005, this is the discourse of the Hellenophilic perspective that supports a racist approach based on Western superiority. However, as a result of the chain of events that developed after the Renaissance and Reformation movements, the idea of the nation-state, which spread around the world with the French Revolution, brought expressions such as parliament, democracy, and republic back to the agenda as per Hellenophilic myths and turned them into concepts of governance. In the democracy seen in ancient Greece, women and slaves cannot vote. A form of government that includes a very small part of society is called "democracy". However, it has nothing to do with the rule of the people.

In order to speak of a democracy, all individuals who make up a society must have the right to "vote", which is at least the right to representation, even if it is controversial. In the beginning, the right to vote was granted only to men. Can it be said that democracy began when women gained the right to vote in the 19th century? However, in the *Isle of Man* (1881) and in some colonies in Northern Europe, only rich women and wealthy people were allowed to vote. In 1894, all women in Australia were granted the right to vote, but not the indigenous Aborigines. In the early 20th century, some countries such as New Zealand, Finland, Turkey, Norway and the Soviet Union recognized the right of all citizens to vote, regardless of gender or wealth.

Voting, in other words, representative democracy, is not a direct democracy. If we talk about democracy, it must be direct democracy. Because one person cannot represent another person. They cannot take over their rights, even under the name of "voting". In this sense, if we are to speak of a democracy, it can only be realized in a community, not in a large society. By this definition, direct democracy has historically been practiced in communities of a small number of people. Direct democracy is a type of democracy in which the people exercise their sovereignty personally and directly. Is it necessary to speak of a society and a state in order to speak of democracy? Perhaps the centralized state must be abolished for democracy to exist. If we understand democracy to mean the right of all groups to have a say, then democracy will disappear by the end of the 21st century, once states have emerged. Because having a say in governance is also a class phenomenon.

The first known examples of democracy in history are actually stateless societies. Examples of democracy can be seen in savage societies and pre-state peoples. For example, the early Ethiopian communities studied did not have a hegemonic leader in the sense recognised today (Amborn, 2019). Anthropologist Pierre Clastres' research in the western regions of present-day Brazil (Segovia, 2019), James C. Scott's interpretations of the findings of early communities in northeastern India and Burma, studies on the Nuer in South Sudan (Nag, 2022), Radcliffe-Brown's studies on the aborigines (Lewis, 2022), and many other examples show that most of the early communities did not have a state or a leader in today's sense. If we talk about a democratic society, the example is neither Ancient Greece nor the United States of America. Example is wild societies and pre-state peoples. Because there, the right to have a say has not yet been limited by gender or wealth.

In fact, true societies had examples of democracy before the establishment of centralized states. These are mostly found within religious groups. The Quranic concepts of "meshveret" and "shura" are examples

of direct democracy. Mashwarah and Shura are the Islamic form of government mentioned in the Qur'an. It is a communal form of government and democracy model that emphasises dialogue when deciding on an issue and where people can choose. The Prophet Muhammad provided an example of democracy and within his community, almost everyone had a say, except homosexuals. This was one of the most democratic practices at the time. So why have eastern societies not been able to maintain their democratic practices? How did they lose their egalitarian and democratic character?

Short-lived beginnings of democracy were buried in history as deep-rooted understandings that brought with them class and gender distinctions could not be broken by revolutionaries such as prophets, dervishes, etc., and ties such as lineage, family, tribe, clan, etc. were emphasized. Although democratic and egalitarian traditions persisted among external and outsider groups far from the center of the state, they could not become an orthodox understanding. This is one of the reasons why most Asian states today are totalitarian and ruled by states that do not emphasize respect for human rights.

Is democracy a myth?

The American Declaration of Independence is important in terms of political history. For the first time before the French Revolution, the fundamental rights and freedoms that people are born with and the basic principle of democracy were established in a document (Sarica, 1983: 23). Unfortunately, this document based on human rights remained on paper for a long time. It took a period of struggle for blacks, women, homosexuals and those who could not own wealth to be equalized with the status of "citizen". Around the same time as the declaration of the Declaration of Independence in the United States in 1776, thinkers who defended the idea of democracy and human rights emerged in continental Europe in the process leading up to the revolution in France.

French Revolution, Enlightenment Philosophy: It will be necessary to briefly mention the intellectual currents that prepared the French Revolution and initiated the French Revolution. 18th century was the "Century of Philosophers". First, the laws of nature were clarified within the possibilities of the day and became the property of human consciousness. The English Newton, the French Lagrange, Laplace, and Buffon were studying the laws of nature. On the other hand, the physiocrats, who investigated how wealth was produced, distributed, and consumed in society, saw the existence of a set of immutable laws and thus put forward the first laws of economics. By looking at these laws, the physiocrats criticized the society based on customs, the privileges of the church, and the traditions of the monarchy. Montesquieu proposes the separation of powers, that is, the separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers, to prevent despotism and ensure freedom. J.J. Rousseau emphasized that sovereignty belongs to the people and cannot be transferred to anyone. Voltaire declared war on the church and defended secular thought. These thinkers laid down the basic rules of political democracy (Sarica, 1983: 24).

The historical reasons for the growth of Mass Culture since the 1800s are quite clear. With the democratic revolution and mass education taking culture out of the monopoly of the upper classes, big business found a highly profitable market in the cultural demands of the newly enlightened masses. At the same time, advances in technology made it possible to produce an abundance of books, magazines, paintings, pictures, etc. to meet this demand. Modern technology has also led to new discoveries such as cinema, radio, and television, which are particularly conducive to mass production and distribution (Mac Donald, 2011: 163). In the later stages of capitalism, culture was relatively out of the hands of the upper

classes, but unfortunately, it became a tool of corporate manipulation. Moreover, the structure of education that serves pragmatic interests has brought along populist nationalism and religiosity. This populism, on the other hand, has merged with chaos and spectacle thanks to the parties fed by corporations, and democracy has been transformed into a complete separation from the rule of the people, which is the meaning of the word.

Jean Jaques Rousseau made the following statements about democracy many years ago: "*The rule of democracy, in general, is favorable to small states; the rule of the aristocracy to medium states; the rule of the monarchy to large states*" (Rousseau, 2001: 79).

The small states that Rousseau refers to above are in fact stateless or communal communities with small populations and granting high powers to municipalities. He calls it democracy when the people living directly at the local level determine their own laws, not from a capital or a center miles away. A philosopher intuited that centralized rule of countries with large populations would not recognize human rights and would turn into a monarchy or oligarchy. Democracy is democracy without representation and only when it is carried out directly by the people.

Alain Touraine stated that democracy won because of the collapse of the Soviet Union (2002: 17), failing to see that it was a technocracy based on corporations that won. There is no democracy in America. A corporate oligarchy maintains colonialism and imperialism both inside and outside the country under the myth of democracy. Touraine, on the other hand, in his statement that democracy has won, claims that as the market economy creates an industrial society on its own, it will also create an open, political and competitive market (2002: 18). However, the situation has never been as Touraine says in any capitalist country. There is no open competition in these countries; behind the pretense of open competition, there is corporate domination. Although Touraine defines democracy as participation and pluralism and says that it is the defense of diversity in culture and criticizes its shortcomings in the United States, the form of government he is talking about is not democracy. It is a corporate rule hidden behind a myth of democracy.

According to thinkers of various periods, democracy has been a myth. However, it should be taken into consideration that democracy is an ideal. To realise this ideal, a non-crowded community where people know each other is indispensable. Many of these thinkers have interpreted democracy through a nation-state or society. Democracy can be experienced in a community, not in an organisation.

So how is it that the people living in this aquarium see the form of government as democracy and feel free? Subjects in the capitalist structure see their existence as a project. Underneath the construction of the self as a project, there is a much more violent subordination. Freed from external pressures within the myth of democracy, subjects are programmed to put pressure on their own selves. Programs to perform better and move forward, personal agendas and reminders on phones give the subject the delusion of constantly improving performance and development. In this way, the freedom to be able to do generates more pressure than the "must do" which generates orders and prohibitions. This is because the external pressure of "you have to" has limits, but in the freedom to do, the subject is constantly pushing himself/herself. Depression and exhaustion syndromes are manifestations of new capitalism's understanding of "freedom". The performance subject who thinks he/she is free is a new type of slave (Han, 2022). These new types of slaves of neoliberalism are incapable of interacting with people, and lacking a purpose. However, to be free means to be among friends. Derived from the English word "friend", "free" refers to the comfort felt in intimate settings. Freedom is essentially a relationship word. One feels free only in an intimate relationship.

Neoliberalism's understanding of freedom is a very efficient and insidious system for exploiting subjects. The understanding of freedom within the myth of democracy is the reduction of subjects to the status of the sexual organs of capital (Han, 2022). What Han wants to explain here is the state of feeling that capital's understanding of freedom integrates people into the system to put them to work again and consume more. In other words, subjects define freedom as a way of release. They see it as a way to release the stress within the system, and economic actions surround these ways of escape. However, freedom can reside in the comfort of being sincere and being recognised/known.

Beyond these historical developments, unfortunately, democracy has remained in the ideas of philosophers or the texts of constitutions. Almost all states in the West glorify democracy and turn it into a myth. In reality, however, they are technocrats, gerontocrats, kleptocrats, or, as Gürel in another work of his, pornocrats as the total of all critical "krates". Nevertheless, they present bourgeois democracy as democracy and conduct political participation through a populist "right to vote". What is happening is not democracy but a corporate oligarchy. Whatever its name, one thing is clear: one cannot be a civilian, a democrat, or a democracy with the will of the state (İnsel, 1990: 211).

Democracy, but Democracy for Whom?

Lenin is known all over the world as an anti-democrat. This is one of the greatest injustices in history. Because of his circumstances, he could not leave a democratic structure and Stalin, who followed him, was certainly not a democrat. However, Lenin did implement some democratic practices despite the difficult conditions. The following sentence from Lenin shows his relationship with democracy: "*Whoever wants to arrive at socialism by any other road than that of political democracy will inevitably arrive at absurd and reactionary conclusions, both economically and politically*" (Lenin, 1994: 24). Many people may find it interesting that the founder of the Soviet Union, which in practice failed to realize the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and turned into an oligarchy of Bolsheviks under the name "dictatorship of the proletariat" and became one of the most terrible centralized states in history, attached importance to democracy. Lenin asked the most important and, today, the most necessary question about democracy: "Democracy, but democracy for whom, the democracy of the people or bourgeois democracy?" This is a key question.

If democracy does not include all the subjects living in a society, then what we have is bourgeois democracy, which is a veil for an oligarchic rule. Almost all countries that claim to be democratic are ruled by an oligarchy behind the myth of democracy. However, as a requirement of creating a consumer society, they do not marginalize people and open the doors of consumption to everyone, uniting them in shopping malls regardless of their ideas, gender, ethnicity, or lifestyle. In the East, class lines and distinctions are much sharper as cheap labor continues to be available in many countries. For the rich and the rulers who are close to the ruling classes, these geographies are very democratic. For the working people and those who have been marginalized and turned into cheap labor, the situation is quite the opposite.

Remnants of the Asiatic Mode of Production

Why are the Majority of Asian Countries Not Democratic? Karl Marx's famous work "The Asiatic Mode of Production" gives a basic clue about the administrative origins of Asian countries. Marx and Engels saw that the phenomena of property and individualization in Asian societies developed differently from Western societies and wrote about it. In the second volume of Capital, which Engels edited after Marx's death, Marx states that the existence of wage labor on a social scale is a sine qua non-condition for the transformation

of money into commodities and money-capital into productive capital and that the relations of production in Russia produced a forced serf phenomenon (Marx, 2021). The formation of the wage laborer is one of the basic elements of Marx's theory. However, the fact that he saw that this did not happen in Eastern societies brought about the need for new analysis and analysis in these geographies.

The absence of land ownership over a long period of time is the key to the existence of social relations in the entire East. The ownership of land necessitates a tyrannical landowning state since the principles of irrigation of large tracts of land are based on coercive distribution. For this reason, even the feudal division of land developed very late in these geographies. Due to climatic and regional conditions, artificial irrigation with canals and waterways is the basis of Eastern agriculture. From Egypt and India to Mesopotamia and Iran, irrigation is supported by canals. The necessity of economic and communal use of water brings with it centralized land ownership (Marx, Engels, 1853). If there is common ownership of land, the productive individual cannot produce surplus value from the commodity he or she produces privately and independently, and no commodity with an exchange value can arise which can lead to alienation. The subjects of society realize production only in terms of products that have use-value. Therefore, the individual cannot be separated from other individuals and a collective culture takes root. For a long time in the Asian mode of production, the basic production was based on use-value. According to Engels, the state's handling of public affairs entirely through bureaucracy and autarchic village economies are also the reasons for the static structure of Asian societies (Divitçioğlu, 1981).

The Asian Mode of Production is a theory that explains why democracy has not developed in the origins of Asian societies. However, along with this theory, colonialism and post-colonialism relations also explain the harsh class differences and totalitarian states in these societies. Reports from the British and Dutch East India Companies indicate that until the early 18th century, Asian trading partners were reluctant to accept barter goods other than silver. These companies were the forerunners of today's joint stock companies and had a huge volume of trade for their time. Initially, capitalism showed its barbarism in the Indonesian archipelago. In the mid-18th century, the conquest of India gave the British textile industry an important boost for its industrial perspective (Biermann, Klönne, 2007). Eric Hobsbawm argues that India's disasters were the crucial reason for the rise of Great Britain: "*When we talk about the industrial revolution, we understand the cotton industry. The foundations of the British cotton industry are not a competitive advantage, but a monopoly in the colonies by force of arms. Capitalist markets gave the British Empire an advantage over itself, its navy, and its position in trade*" (Hobsbawm, 1998: 55). After the defeat of the Mongol-dominated Bengal Army at the Battle of Plassey in 1757, they took the fertile lands under their sovereignty and began to pour the riches of Asia into Europe. After India's cotton, China's tea also fell into British hands and they turned China into an opium market. After the Opium War that started in 1842 and the Treaty of Nanjing, they started to turn Hongkong into their market. In the post-war agreements, the concessions of the capitalists expanded and the number of open ports increased (Luraghi, 2000). Increasing these examples is beyond the scope of this article. But it is this deep exploitation that is one of the main factors influencing the fate of the forms of governance in Asian countries. However, this exploitation cannot be realized without taking over political administrations. Especially in post-colonialism, the next stage of colonialism, the colonial state withdrew from the territories under its sovereignty and continued to increase its trade opportunities by influencing the governance of those territories. According to Mandel (1986: 30), technological breakthroughs at the points where capital is concentrated bring about a radical revision of the

basic techniques of capitalist production and distribution in all areas, including transportation and communication.

Mandel argues that labor organizations can undergo radical changes during the long waves of capitalism, which can lead to working-class resistance and production disruptions (1986: 45). A high degree of totalitarianism is advantageous for the ruling classes in Asian countries to prevent technological breakthroughs from causing this. This is why these countries are ruled by totalitarian regimes such as oligarchs, families, kings, etc. They continue to be ruled by totalitarian regimes such as oligarchs, families, kings, etc. Because the productive or comprador bourgeoisie in these countries sees that the highest degree of submission of the subjects that make up society produces profitable results for them. Any process of democratization could undermine these profit centers for the benefit of the rulers.

Economic Growth is not Democratisation

Toussaint mentions that especially after the neo-liberal waves, structural adjustment programs developed by the World Bank and the IMF opened up profitable economic sectors in Asian countries to multinational corporations (1999). The ruling classes that profit from the exploitation of their own citizens in capitalist poles like Japan in their role of providing cheap manual labor may not want such a system to be democratized. Of course, the economies of some Asian countries are developing. But the fundamental question here is this: Is the development of a country measured by economic growth? Does the fact that the people living in that country enjoy "human rights" and equal access to health, education, arts, and cultural activities make it developed? Democratization prioritizes the latter. The exploitation of child laborers in mines and in various sectors, the increasing wealth of local and national clergy through communal relations, various human rights crimes, and malnutrition are not the fate of many Asian countries.

It is no coincidence that the Asian countries of Saudi Arabia, Turkey and China are always at the top of the list of arms trade buyers (Burrows 2003: 21; Stergiou, Kollias, 2022; Daniel 2019; Kenner, Ahmad, 2021) and that they are also among the weakest countries in terms of "human rights". According to democracy report published in 2022, Turkey ranked 103rd out of 167 countries, while China ranked 148th and Saudi Arabia 152nd (Democracy Index, 2022). Turkey, which looks democratic to the capitalist Western countries under the veil of democracy but is actually notorious for its anti-democratic practices, and Saudi Arabia and China, which are already known to be anti-democratic, live in inhumane conditions for the vast majority of their people, even though they have an abundance of capital in economic terms. Through dictatorial laws to protect cheap labor, they sell off their own people to corporations (Amin 2020; Başkaya 2021, Levent 2019, Harvey 2020). It is observed that budget allocations for defence in Turkey have been increasing each year compared to the previous year. In 2018, arms allocations increased compared to last year. Shares are transferred to the defence industry through tax regulations. In addition, the increase in the percentage of defence expenditures in GNP suggests that defence expenditures positively impact the country's economy (Baran, 2018). In contrast to the views that the impact of the arms industry on the economy is positive, many studies on poverty statistics in Turkey show that this poverty is increasing daily and that the country's middle class is disappearing. The disappearance of a country's middle-class

population is one of the strongest proofs that it is an underdeveloped country (Sefa 2021; Yıldırım 2019; Saçlı 2019).

If the centers of sex work created in countries like Thailand and the Philippines can turn their own people into a product while providing profit to the industries of developing countries, it is time to discuss capitalism. Democracy is a regime with a questionable relationship with capitalism. Because democracy cannot coexist with wealth inequality. As mentioned at the beginning of the study, the countries that are claimed to be "democratic" today are the countries where corporate domination continues. This domination, which continues all over the world, is mostly maintained by the marketing of a "myth of democracy" in the West and totalitarian regimes in the East.

Capitalism developed in the centers on the basis of bourgeois national states until the end of the second world war. These bourgeois national states are themselves a product of capitalism. Their evolution was marked by capitalism. The main historical product of this development is the consolidation of capitalist national economies. In contrast, the spread of capitalism on a world scale did not allow the periphery to build national economies based on its own strength in the same way (Amin, 1993: 35). Whatever the direction of its movement, the trend since the 1970s has been one of great geographical mobility of capital. Capitalist organizations prefer fluidity. Cash flows are extraordinarily fluid (Arrighi, 2000: 21). During the 1980s, loans to national economies were enthusiastically welcomed by right-wing conservative governments. The state apparatuses that had protected monetarist policies merged with corporations through massive privatizations. The market, aided by the deregulation of credit controls, liberated money from labor. Monetarist regimes expand by feeding on themselves and breaking the relationship between labor and money (Bonefeld, 2007). The relationship between labor and money requires slave labor, especially in countries with high production volumes. In order to create slave labor, states are obliged to suspend "human rights".

Conclusion

Democracy is a system that cannot be practiced today because the definition of "the people" has changed from its meaning in Ancient Greece. In Ancient Greece, democracy was the rule of the people. Because here the people do not include all the subjects of society. The word "people" represents only rich men and excludes slaves and women. Over time, democracy emerged claiming to include all subjects, but this was not realized. Sometimes it could not be realized in the late 19th century when women could not vote due to gender-based discrimination, and soon afterward, the discourses of power came to the fore due to the unequal distribution of wealth in capitalism. In many countries that claim to be democratic, the discourse of the owners of capital is more powerful than the majority.

For democracy to be realized, the state must be blind to gender, ethnicity, and religious discrimination and must not allow wealth to be concentrated in the hands of one group or another. The state should not interfere in any way with the way of life of civil society and should organize society as decentralized and autonomous as possible. The legal systems of autonomous organizations are suitable for direct democracy. In a representative democracy, democracy cannot be realized because people attribute their natural rights

to a representative. Moreover, since this representative is often a wealthy person, he or she is often unfamiliar with the lives and problems of those who do not have access to capital.

This makes democracy a populist myth. In countries where democracy does not exist, one cannot talk about the validity of human rights. Behind the despotism and tyranny in these countries are hidden criminal partnerships such as war, mafia, drugs, etc. These criminal partnerships have turned the history of capitalism into a history of crime. The real face of the nation-states, which exists just behind the heroism in their official history and which is often untold to the masses, is based on blood and hatred.

Democracy can only be realized in autonomous organizations based on one-to-one relations. As long as these organizations are ruled from the center or capital, this regime will continue to exploit the peoples of the world and nature as a regime of fraud. Since there is no democratic nation-state, the responsibility for these negative aspects lies with all of them.

To establish democracy, it is necessary to dismantle and decentralize the state. It is necessary to liberate civil society by destroying the political community and all its projects. A bureaucracy can be created by producing mechanisms to prevent class formation. However, this bureaucracy should not take part in determining the limits of freedom of civil society. If the state and political society are pitted against each other, the interests of the classes that dominate the state will soon suffocate the plurality. Multiplicity is cultural diversity and the ability of people to have different qualities from each other. The state, which hegemonically produces the notion of "us" and organizes this plurality through artificial constructions of identity, uniformizes this plurality. If political society and civil society are confused with each other, hegemony will be produced that will not appear as a simple expansion of dominant economic interests, but as the insidious establishment and legitimization of a political and legal system at every point. This is precisely what Gasset (Gasset, 1992: 19) criticizes as "hyper-democracy" by distrusting democracy. This criticism is a criticism of the process of democracy in practice.

Is democracy necessary for Asian countries in the non-democratic group? If it is a Western democracy, Western democracy is not necessary because it is not a democracy. But an autonomist and communal democracy are necessary for the whole world. In Asian countries such as India, Japan, China, Russia, North Korea and South Korea, the freedoms of the public sphere of Western democracies cannot even be mentioned today. Although based on written constitutions, most of these countries still need to improve due to the failure to break the traditionalism in social relations and the lack of a human rights myth as in Europe. Freedom of the press, imprisonment of dissidents, extra-legal pressures on the LGBTI+ community and many other anti-democratic practices are indicators that these societies are far from democracy.

The history of Western democracies is mostly a history of revolutions. These revolutions brought almost all classes of society into politics and expanded the public sphere and the relative democratisation of Asian countries. However, in most Asian countries, political changes and transformations have not been realised in a way to spread to the whole society, and the political conflicts within the inner periphery of the ruling class have not applied to all types. Just when Russia was about to break out of this pattern, the dictatorship of the Soviet Union prevented democracy from spreading to the people. In this context, the people of Asia cannot participate in politics because they cannot participate in governance and are mainly used to being

ruled by a party or a group. For this reason, a statist and monist structure persists in many of them, and dictatorships can still be seen in many.

References

- Amborn, H. (2019). *Law as Refuge of Anarchy: Societies without Hegemony or State* (Vol. 15). MIT Press.
- Amin, S. (1993). *Kaos İmparatorluğu*, (Çev. Işık Soner). İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.
- Amin, S. (2020). *Modernite, Demokrasi ve Din: Kültüralizmlerin Eleştirisi*. Ankara: Yordam Kitap.
- Arrighi, G. (2000). *Uzun Yirminci Yüzyıl*, (Çev. Recep Boztemur). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Baran, T. (2018). "Türkiye'de Savunma Sanayi Sektörünün İncelenmesi ve Savunma Harcamalarının Ekonomi Üzerindeki Etkilerinin Değerlendirilmesi", *Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 4 (2), 58-81.
- Başkaya, F. (2021). *Eko-Sosyalist Paradigma: Komünist Topluma Giden Yol*. Ankara: Yordam Kitap.
- Biermann, W; Klönne, A. (2007). *Kapitalizmin Suç Tarihi*, (Çev. Bülent Özçelik). Ankara: PhoenixYayınevi.
- Bonefeld, W; Holloway, J. (2007). *Küreselleşme Çağında Para ve Sınıf Mücadelesi*, (Çev. Münevver Çelik). İstanbul, Otonom Yayıncılık.
- Burrows, G. (2003). *Silah Ticareti Klavuzu*, (Çev. Hayrullah Doğan). İstanbul: Metis Yayıncılık.
- Conner Clifford, D. (2005). A people's history of science: Miners, midwives, and 'low mechanics'.
- Conner, C. D. (2005). *A People's History of Science*. New York: Nation Books.
- Daniel, C. J. (2019). *China's One Belt, One Road Initiative and Its International Arms Sales*. Military review.
- Democracy Index 2022 - Economist Intelligence Unit. EIU.com.
- Divitçioğlu, S. (1981). *Asya Üretim Tarzı ve Osmanlı Toplumunu*. Kırklareli: Sermet Matbaası.
- Gasset, O. Y. (1992). *Kitlelerin İsyanı*, (Çev. Nejat Muallimoğulları). İstanbul: Bedir.
- Gasset, O. Y. (1992). *Tarihsel Bunalım ve İnsan*, (Çev. Neyire Gül Işık). İstanbul, Metis.
- Han, B. C. (2022). *Psikopolitika*, (Çev. Haluk Barışcan). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Harvey, D. (2020). The anti-capitalist chronicles (p. 50). London: Pluto Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1998). *Sanayi ve İmparatorluk*, (Çev. Abdullah Ersoy). Ankara: Dost Kitabevi.
- İnsel, A. (1990). *Türkiye Toplumunun Bunalımı*. Ankara: Birikim Yayınları.
- Kenner, D., ve Al-Ahmad, K. (2021). *The US-Saudi Economic Relationship: More than Arms and Oil*. King Faisal Center for Research and Islamic Studies.
- Levent, A. (2019). David Harvey, Marx, Sermaye ve İktisadi Aklın Cinneti, İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 2017, 239 s. İnsan ve Toplum, 9(2), 165-169.
- Lenin, V. İ. (1994). *Demokratik Devrimde Sosyal-Demokrasinin İki Taktiği*, (Çev. Saliha Nazlı Kaya). İstanbul: İnter Yayınları.

- Lewis, H. S. (2022). *African Political Systems and Political Anthropology*. African Political Systems Revisited: Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power, 26, 15.
- Luraghi, R. (2000). *Sömürgecilik Tarihi*, (Çev. Halim İnal). İstanbul: Kitap Deyince Yayınları.
- MacDonald, D. (2011). *Masscult and Midcult*. New York: NYRB Classics.
- Mandel, E. (1986). *Kapitalist Gelişmenin Uzun Dalgaları*, (Çev. Doğan Işık). İstanbul: Yazın Yayıncılık.
- Marx, K. (2021). *Kapital*, (II. Cilt), (Çev: Mehmet Selik). İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.
- Marx, K; Engels, F. (1853). *The First Indian World Independence: 1857-1859*. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- Nag, S. (2022). Book review: Jangkhomang Guite, Against State, Against History: Freedom, Resistance, and Statelessness in Upland Northeast India.
- Rousseau, J. J. (2001). *Toplum Sözleşmesi*, (Çev. Vedat Günyol). İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.
- Saçlı, A. (2019). "Türkiye'de Kentsel Yoksulluk Olgusu Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme". *Türkiye Siyaset Bilimi Dergisi*, 2 (2), 1-21.
- Sarıca, M. (1983). *Siyasal Tarih*. Ankara: Ar Basım Yayın.
- Sefa, U. L. U. (2021). "İnsan Hakları Bakış Açısı ile Türkiye'de Yoksulluk İstatistikleri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", *Hak İş Uluslararası Emek ve Toplum Dergisi*, 10 (28), 537-555.
- Segovia, C. (2019). "Re-theorising the Social and its Models after Lévi-Strauss's and Pierre Clastres's Study of Stateless Social Assemblages". *Anarchist Studies*, 27 (2), 41-60.
- Skalník, P. (2022). "A New Approach to the Political Anthropology of Africa". *African Political Systems Revisited: Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power*, 26, 102.
- Stergiou, A., ve Kollias, C. (2022). "The Political Economy of Turkish Foreign Policy". *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 24 (1), 42-59.
- Touraine, A. (2002). *Demokrasi Nedir?*, (Çev. Olcay Kunal). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Toussaint, E. (1999). *Ya Paranı Ya Canını*, (Çev. Maral Berberyan). İstanbul: Yazın Yayıncılık.
- Yıldırım, A. (2019). "Türkiye'de Yoksulluk ve Yoksullukla Mücadele". *İktisadi ve İdari Yaklaşımlar Dergisi*, 1 (1), 15-33.